



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,754	12/21/2000	Randall G. Smith	POLY8	1016
6980 7590 05/23/2008 TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP 600 PEACHTREE STREET, NE ATLANTA, GA 30308				
EXAMINER				
BHAT, ADITYA S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2863				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 09/746,754	Applicant(s) SMITH ET AL.
Examiner ADITYA S. BHAT	Art Unit 2863

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
 NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/John E Barlow Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2863

/Aditya Bhat/
Examiner, Art Unit 2863

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the 35 USC 103 rejection is believed to be proper. In this instance applicant argues that the obvious modification suggested in the 103 rejection would not have been obvious. Specifically applicant argues that the modification of the prior art is unsound because steps 2-4 of the prior art are not "burdensome" and "time consuming". Further applicant argues that the time savings would be marginal and that all other users who desire an orientation different from the default would be faced with the task of navigating toolbars and menus to select the appropriate orientation level.

In applicants arguments applicant admit that there would be a marginal time savings. Applicant attempts to negate the obvious reason that would provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to bypass the undesired steps by referring to the motivation as " marginal". In the process applicant has reinforced examiners position by admitting that there would be a "time saving", although marginal.

Further, in response to applicants argument that only users who have selected the default orientation would save time, the claimed invention does not limit the scope of the invention to any particular user group. Therefore if bypassing the undesired step would benefit at least a portion of the user group and there would be proper motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so then the rejection would be and is proper. Further applicant admits that this obvious modification would be desirable to users who have selected the default orientation. For the aforementioned reasons the rejection is deemed proper. the 35 USC 103 rejection is believed to be proper. In this instance applicant argues that the obvious modification suggested in the 103 rejection would not have been obvious.

Specifically applicant argues that the modification of the prior art is unsound because steps 2-4 of the prior art are not "burdensome" and "time consuming". Further applicant argues that the time savings would be marginal and that all other users who desire an orientation different from the default would be faced with the task of navigating toolbars and menus to select the appropriate orientation level.

In applicants arguments applicant admit that there would be a marginal time savings. Applicant attempts to negate the obvious reason that would provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to bypass the undesired steps by referring to the motivation as " marginal". In the process applicant has reinforced examiners position by admitting that there would be a "time saving", although marginal.

Further, in response to applicants argument that only users who have selected the default orientation would save time, the claimed invention does not limit the scope of the invention to any particular user group. Therefore if bypassing the undesired step would benefit at least a portion of the user group and there would be proper motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so then the rejection would be and is proper. Further applicant admits that this obvious modification would be desirable to users who have selected the default orientation. For the aforementioned reasons the rejection is deemed proper.